

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 20 are amended. Claims 5 and 10 were previously cancelled. Reconsideration and allowance of all the pending claims is respectfully requested in view of the arguments below.

### **Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C §112**

On page 2, the Office Action indicates that Claims 20 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. On Page 3, the Office Action indicates that Claims 1-4, 6-9, and 11-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph as being indefinite.

As to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, Claims 1 and 20 are amended to remove that portion which is not specifically disclosed. As to the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph, Claims 1 and 20 are amended to address the objections based on the lack of antecedent basis and the gap between steps. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C §112 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraphs against Claims 1 and 20 and also Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-19, and 21 and 22 as they are based on either Claim 1 or Claim 20.

### **Claim rejections under 35 U.S.C §§102-103**

On page 4, the Office Action indicates that Claims 1-2, 4, 8, 12-16, and 18-20 are rejected under either 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or 35 U.S.C §103(c) as either being anticipated by Bartman (US 4,891,053) or as being obvious in view of Bartman. On page 8, the Office Action indicates that Claims 1-4, 11-12, 14-15, and 18-22 are rejected under either 35 U.S.C. §102(b) or 35 U.S.C §103(c) as either being anticipated by Demerritt (US 5,274,502) or as being obvious in view of Demerritt. On Page 12, the Office Action indicates that Claims 3, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(c) as being unpatentable over Bartman in view of Angenent (US 4,895,585). On Page 12, the Office Action indicates that Claims 6, 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(c) as being unpatentable over Bartman in view of Neid (US 5,290,333).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with these positions. As to Bartman, Applicant notes that the Office Action did not specifically address the Claim 1 limitation that the

cylindrical holder is formed in an integrated form with a void part. In Bartman, the form is not integrated. Bartman discloses a form for holding the lens consisting of two portions, an inner ring 5 and an outer ring 7. (see Fig. 1) The relative positions of these rings change during the molding process. Bartman discloses, that the "rings are telescopically slidable with respect to each other." (Col 4, Lines 44-45). In addition, according to Bartman a "jig" is needed to adjust the height or length of the holder in the telescopically extended position. (Col 4, Lines 50-53). By contrast, in the present application the cylindrical holder is formed in an integrated form. The integrated form obviates the need for many of the steps required by Bartman. For example, Bartman teaches arranging a glass preform 3 in the holder 1 while the holder is in an extended position. (Col 5, Lines 7-10). Then Bartman teaches heating up the two in a furnace until the glass starts sagging. (Col 5, Lines 11-13). Then Bartman teaches tilting the holder several times to allow gravity to shape the glass. (Col 5, Lines 15-19). Finally Bartman teaches placing the holder in a press to slidably press the inner ring 5 and outer ring 7 together. (Col 5, Lines 37-39). In the present application, however, the glass preform and holder are simply placed in the press, heated and then joined via the pressing action. Bartman therefore, does not anticipate Claim1. In addition, Bartman does not render Claim 1 obvious, because Bartman teaches one of ordinary skill in the art to go through several additional process steps not needed in the present application.

In addition, neither reference discloses the limitations of amended Claims 1 and 20, that the optical-element material includes a volume of material for forming a lens and an extra volume for compensating for a volume error, the extra volume being less than a volume of the void part of the cylindrical holder. Bartman teaches providing an "an overdimension volume of material", but does not limit the amount the volume. The reason for this is clear in view of the process described above. During the pressing process, any excess material is squeezed out in the form of a collar 25. As such, Bartman does not anticipate this limitation. Moreover, Bartman would not teach one of ordinary skill in the art not to limit the volume because in Bartman the excess volume is squeezed out.

As to Demerritt, Applicant notes that the Office Action places reliance on Fig. 4. with respect to this limitation. However, as shown in Fig. 4, the optical-element material

completely fills in the void. In other words, Demerritt discloses the extra volume being equal to the volume of the void part and not less. Demerritt, therefore, does not anticipate Claim 1. In addition, one of ordinary skill would understand that this leaves no margin for error in the volume of optical-element material. As noted by the Applicant, providing an extra volume of optical-element material and a cavity for the extra material to flow improves the accuracy of the resultant lens. (Paragraph 30). Therefore, the process disclosed in Demerritt cannot produce as accurate a lens as the process disclosed in the present application. One of ordinary skill in view of Demerritt would not be able to produce the accurate lens produced by the manufacturing method disclosed in the present application. In view of the arguments presented above, Applicant respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections against Claims 1 and 20 and also Claims 2-4, 6-9, 11-19, and 21 and 22 as they are based on either Claim 1 or Claim 20.

Applicant believes that the arguments presented herein are sufficient to overcome the several rejections. Accordingly, allowance of all the Claims is respectfully requested. Should the examiner deem a telephone conference to be of assistance in advancing the application to allowance, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Gustavo Siller, Jr./

Gustavo Siller, Jr.  
Registration No. 32,305  
Attorney for Applicant

September 4, 2008  
BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
P.O. BOX 10395  
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610  
(312) 321-4200